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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of anti-corruption strategies in Kenya; led by the following research questions; what are the some of the main causes of corruption in Kenya? What are some of the common forms of corruption? What are the anti-corruption strategies that have been adopted in Kenya? What are the legal and constitutional frameworks for combating corruption in Kenya? How have the anti-corruption strategies in Kenya influenced the trends of corruption in Kenya? The methodology used was a descriptive pattern of research design. The population for the study included 1024 individuals working with the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (EACC) in Nairobi. The sampling frame comprised of a list of all the staff at the EACC, obtained at the human resources office. The research used a semi-structured interview method to gather data from the respondents selected through a randomized computer generated system. The data was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program. The study found that there were several causal factors to corruption in Kenya; institutional weaknesses, poor pay packages for the civil servants and lack of transparency and accountability in public institutions were some of the major causes of corruption in Kenya. It also determined that there were various forms of corruption; petty corruption, grand corruption, bureaucratic corruption, political corruption as well as private sector corruption. Various anti-corruption strategies were found to be existent and implemented by the government. These strategies range from legal, institutional through to financial. It also found out further that the government has put in place institutional frameworks to reduce the level of bureaucratic corruption in the country. It found that there were mixed results with regard to the effectiveness of the anti-corruption strategies employed in Kenya. The study concludes by contending that there are several factors to blame for the existence of corruption in Kenya which are mostly associated with the political culture in Kenya and the lack of political will to resolve and combat them. It also contends that the existence of the legal and institutional frameworks for combating corruption provides a credible opportunity for dealing with the vice. The study recommends that the specific institutions charged with combating corruption should be strengthened and provided with prosecutorial powers.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background Study

Corruption is conceived within the literature on governance and economics as the exploitation of public office for private gains by those entrusted with public offices (Treisman, 2000). Uneke (2010, p.111) opines that corruption has had “variegated frequency in different times and at different places with varying degrees of damaging consequences”. Certainly, corruption is indicted for a multiplicity of socio-economic and even political problems and the issue of corruption has been a social and public administration quandary since the dawn of social organization (Bardhan, 2000). Corruption is manifested in several ways including the abuse of public office for private gain, bribery, extortion, fraud and embezzlement among other gross misconduct of persons that have been entrusted with public offices.

Corruption is indicted for the economic atavisms of the developing countries as it is conceived to precipitate a variety of problems of profound economic consequences (Fayemi, 2009). According to Uneke (2010), corruption leads to the distortion of competition and fair market structures, the looting of public treasury, the deterrence of both local and international investment, the undercutting of the development and appreciation of democratic process and the establishment of effective and democratic public institutions.

Corruption has manifested itself as a global vice with corrupt practices being witnessed in different countries all over the world (Hanna, et al., 2011). Certainly, the political scandals that have occurred in most countries around the world since the end of the Cold War has not only sparked global public outrage against corruption but has demonstrated that corruption is a problem for the developed and the developing countries alike but with a slight intensity among the latter (Triesman, 2000).

According to Uneke (2010), corruption is one of the key explanations of the underdevelopment in the developing world including Africa. Most sub-Saharan African countries have been independent for over four decades nonetheless; there has been stagnation or minimal progress in terms of socio-economic growth and development.
(Uneke, 2010). There are multiple explanations to this atavistic economic status of African countries; however, endemic corruption among the majority of these countries offers one of the best conceptualizations of these socio-economic states of the sub-Saharan African nations.

Therefore, as Ikubaje (2010) contends, anti-corruption strategies continue to wax strong among the key priorities of governments and development partners owing to the assumed association between corruption and stagnation in the socio-political and economic underdevelopment of the continental states. Africa’s reputation for corruption has not changed according to the latest world corruption rankings. This was indicated by the fact that in the survey conducted by Transparency International in 2013, no African country was included among the top twenty least corrupt countries in the world and Somalia was ranked as the most corrupt country in the world (Africartoons, 2014).

The reasons why Africa scores so poorly in global rankings of the least corrupt countries are perceptible and include the fact that in Africa, the vice ranges from high-level political graft which amounts to billions of dollars to law-level bribes which are issues to low-ranking public officials such as the police and customs officials (Triesman, 2000). According to Hanson (2009), a study conducted by the African Union in 2002 indicated that the cost of corruption to the continent was estimated at $150 billion annually which far outweighed the developmental aid that the continental countries were receiving which was estimated at $22.5 billion in 2008.

Consequently, several African countries have formulated and implemented several programs and policies to fight graft (Ikubaje, 2010). These policies have ranged from financial strategies to political or public policies but have remained largely ineffectual in addressing the scourge of corruption in the continent. In fact, over the past decade, African countries at the pressure of the Western donors have implemented policies aimed at boosting transparency and good governance as well as sector reforms with an aim of fighting corruption (Hanson, 2009). Rwanda, Liberia, Tanzania, Mauritius and Ghana have been lauded as having made commendable gains in the war against graft.

On the other hand other regional countries especially regional hegemonies including Nigeria, South Africa and Kenya have not made serious headways in fighting corruption (Hanson, 2009). In Kenya corruption, the modern foundation of corruption is traceable
to the first republic or the immediate post-independent political dispensation. In fact, the three successive regimes that have existed since Kenya’s independence in 1963; the Kenyatta, the Moi and the Kibaki governments have preferred the spoils system in which the President, upon coming to power proceeds to reward his largely incompetent lieutenants mostly from his own ethnic group, with power and authority creating corruption in the public sector (Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission, 2006).

In a report released by Transparency International (TI) in 2003 which ranked countries from the least corrupt to the most corrupt, Kenya was ranked at position 122 out of 133 countries that were surveyed by the international body (Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission, 2006). In 2011, Kenya sank to position 154 out of 182 countries that were surveyed by the Transparency International to assess the level of corruption in the country (Gichio, 2014). Indeed, this is easy to fathom considering the corrupt scandals that had been experienced in the years before the release of the report as well as in the years that followed. Within Kenya, the bribery demand is about 29% as determined by the East African Bribery Index (2012) (Gichio, 2014).

In Kenya corruption manifests itself in various forms including petty and grand corruption, embezzlement of public funds and a system of political patronage which is well entrenched within the fabric of the Kenyan society (Jarso, 2010). Petty corruption implies a situation in which people have to pay money to obtain public services. According to TI, 45% of Kenyans pay bribes to at least one of the nine institutions that they access annually and business in Kenya is almost impossible to operate without facilitation of payments (Gichio, 2014).

Grand corruption is the high-level scandals that occasionally hit the headlines in Kenya (Jarso, 2010). The Goldenberg Scandal was the first major corruption scandal to hit Kenya. According to Gichio (2014), the Goldenberg Scandal in which key government officials in the Moi-regime were implicated allegedly did cost the country over 10% of its Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Since the Goldenberg Scandal, grand corruption scandals have been witnessed in Kenya (Gichio, 2014). These include; the Anglo-Leasing in 2005, the misappropriation of public funds by the National Rainbow Coalition in 2003 when over $12 million was spent by the government to buy luxury cars for mostly personal use by government officials. Fifty-
seven Mercedes-Benz and Land Cruisers were bought at a much higher price than what the government was reported to having spent on combating the number one cause of morbidity and mortality in Kenya – Malaria (Gichio, 2014).

Furthermore, in the recent years several corrupt instances have been witnessed in Kenya (Jarso, 2010). Some of these poignant instances of corruption in public offices corruption include; the Maize Scam of 2009, the Triton Oil Scandal, the November 2009 Free Primary Education (FPE) funds misappropriation, The Nairobi City Council Land scam, the Tokyo Embassy Scandal and the Ministry of Defense public Procurement deal of military hardware form Jordan. These are some of the mega corruption cases that have caused the Kenyan citizens billions of misappropriated funds (Jarso, 2010).

Following growing concerns that the country was sinking in corruption since the early 2000, the government has established several institutions and enacted several laws to combat corruption but however some have hindered the war against graft in Kenya. For instance, in 2007, the Kenyan parliament passed the Statute Law (Miscellaneous Amendments Bill) which restricted the new Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission to graft offenses committed prior to May 2003. This certainly provided amnesty to those implicated in the Goldenberg and the Anglo-Leasing scandals (Jarso, 2010). This was in fact, a major setback considering that fighting corruption had been dominant in Kibaki’s campaign agenda in 2000 (Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission, 2006).

In 2005, Public Procurement and Disposal Bill was adopted (Jarso, 2010). According to Gichio (2014), Kenya has also adopted the Public Service Commission Act which includes a code of regulation for public servants and promotes political independence and requires merit-based recruitment. The would-be whistle blowers on corruption were accorded protection under the Anti-Corruption and Economic Crimes and the Witness Protection Act. The Proceeds of Crime and Money Laundering act was passed in 2009 under international law (Jarso, 2010).

In tandem with the legal frameworks, the institutional frameworks have also been established and include several institutions dedicated to combating corruption. According to Gichio (2014), the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (EACC) was setup in 2011 replacing the now-defunct- Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission (KACC) in the war against graft. Other key institutions include the office of the Attorney General, the
Auditor General, and the Ombudsman which was established to receive all complaints relating to public officials. Another key institution in the war against corruption is the Public Procurement and Oversight Authority (PPOA) (Gichio, 2014).

1.2 Problem Statement
The country also typifies a classic case of how corruption can tip a seemingly stable country into an economic and a political crisis (Hanson, 2009). According to Jarso (2010), hardly a day passes in Kenya without media reporting on a corruption case or scandal in the government. The impact of this vice in the socio-political and economic growth and development is adversely repugnant. Due to corruption within the institutions of governance there is failure in infrastructural development, there is the denial of millions of citizens’ access to public services including health, education and security among others (Jarso, 2010). The need for addressing the issue of corruption has been increasingly perceptible with respect to the restoration of legitimacy in the public offices, the establishment of effective provision of public services and ultimately to hasten socio-economic growth.

The choice of Kenya as case study is pinned on the fact that it presents a multi-explanatory aspect to the causes of corruption including the socio-political, ethno-historical as well as the economic factors. The country has been struggling in the war against corruption over the past decades presenting a background from which to access the strategies that have been adopted to fight the vice.

 Nonetheless, Kenya has struggled to establish frameworks and policies to fight corruption. In fact, the legal frameworks to fight corruption as well as the policies to combat the vice have been in place since 1956 when the Prevention of Corruption Act was established (Hanson, 2009). And since 2002 concerted frameworks for combating corruption have existed as anti-corruption commission has been established and accorded investigative powers. And since the promulgation of the new constitution in 2010 the war against corruption has been intensified (Africartoons, 2014). However, the success and the effectiveness of these anti-corruption strategies have not been examined by scholars (Hanson, 2009).

However, despite its prominence in Kenya’s constitution and political architecture, corruption is still endemic in Kenya raising fundamental questions about the kind of
strategies that have been implemented to fight it and specifically the effectiveness of those strategies (Jarso, 2010). However, despite the trends in corruption in Kenya, there has not been enough scholarly attention being accorded to this problem. Not much has been done to assess the programs and policies that have been established to combat corrupt practices.

Besides, an analysis of the extent to which the policies which have been adopted to fight corruption on Kenya correspond to the causal factors has not been effectively conducted. This study seeks to abridge this literary gap by assessing the causes of corruption in Kenya and the anti-corruption strategies that have been adopted to fight corruption in Kenya. The study will also assess the effectiveness of the anti-corruption strategies by evaluating the extent to which they address the causes.

1.3 Study Purpose
The purpose of the study was to assess the effectiveness of the anti-corruption strategies in Kenya.

1.4 Study Research Questions

i. What are the main causes of corruption in Kenya?
ii. What are some of the common forms of corruption?
iii. What are the anti-corruption strategies that have been adopted in Kenya?
iv. What are the legal and constitutional frameworks for combating corruption in Kenya?
v. How have the anti-corruption strategies in Kenya influenced the trends of corruption in Kenya?

1.5 Objectives of the Research

i. To investigate the causes of corruption in Kenya.
ii. To distinguish the various forms of corruption in Kenya.
iii. To examine the anti-corruption strategies in Kenya.
iv. To assess how the anti-corruption strategies in Kenya have influenced the trends of corruption in Kenya.
v. To determine the legal and constitutional frameworks for combating corruption in Kenya.
1.6 Justification of the Research
The study is aimed at providing sumptuous information that may prove vital to the following groups of people:

1.6.1 The Government of Kenya
The study will provide important information on the various aspects of corruption in Kenya including the causes, mitigation strategies adopted and the impact of the mitigation strategies. Such information will be crucial to the policy makers charged with formulating policies for fighting corruption in Kenya. The study will provide information concerning the policies which have been adopted to fight corruption as well as the effectiveness of such policies. In so doing the study will prove vital to the government in that it will provide an evaluation of the war against corruption in Kenya and therefore help the policy makers and the government officials formulate better strategies or improve the existing ones.

1.6.2 The Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (EACC)
As the anti-corruption agency in Kenya, the EACC will also benefit from the study. The study will not only provide information on the anti-corruption strategies that have been adopted and the extent to which they have contributed to the reduction in corrupt activities in public offices in Kenya, the study will provide vital information concerning means of improving the strategies. The study will also prove vital the EACC in that it will provide information which can be used to train the anti-graft officers on how to deal with corruption in Kenya.

1.6.3 Other Sub-Saharan African Countries
By examining the causes of corruption and the effectiveness of the anti-corruption strategies in Kenya, the study will provide information which will prove vital to other countries in sub-Saharan Africa which are also trying to fight corruption. The policy makers and anti-corruption agencies of other African states can draw comparison between the information provided by this study regarding the causes of corruption and the mitigation strategies with an aim of improving the situation in their countries. The study will provide information regarding which strategies have been successful and which ones
have not and as such provide other countries in sub-Saharan Africa grappling with the same vice of corruption with information regarding which strategies they can adopt.

1.6.4 General Public
The general public also stands to benefit from the study. The study will provide the general public with information regarding the different forms of corruption in the country thereby allowing the general public to identify corruption easily when they happen. The study will also assess the various anti-corruption strategies which have been adopted as well as their effectiveness in addressing corruption in Kenya. In so doing the study will allow the public to judge the extent of the government’s commitment to combating corruption. As such the study will provide the general public with crucial information which will enable them to make informed political decision.

1.6.5 Tomorrow Researchers
The research will revive scholarly interests in this socio-economic menace and thus motivate them to conduct more studies on the issue of corruption in Africa. The study will prove crucial to future researchers in that it will provide information which will help them in boosting their knowledge about corruption and the effectiveness of the anti-corruption strategies and thus help them conduct relevant studies on the subject.

1.7 Format of the Study
This chapter has presented the background of the research and stated the problem as well as the purpose of the study. I have also outlined the research questions that I will endeavor to address. I have also indicated the significance of this project, its scope and accounted for the terms and concepts that will be used throughout the study. The second chapter will provide a literature review with regard to the five research questions. The third chapter will provide a scalding description of the research methodology that will be used during the study. The next chapter will present the findings from the interview questionnaires using descriptive statistics with the aid of tables and bar graphs. The last chapter of my research will recap the whole project including the summary, discussions, and conclusions and finally give its own recommendations for future researchers.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Preamble
This chapter reviews existing literature on corruption and mitigation strategies. The chapter reviews literature, which relates to the five research questions; the causes of corruption; the common forms of corruption, the corruption mitigation strategies, corruption trends and the legal and constitutional framework, put in place to combat the vice. It will also try to identify the gaps in literature and provide the theoretical framework for the study.

2.2 Empirical Review

2.2.1 The Causes of Corruption
Corruption is a practice and a concept that lacks a universally or a globally accepted definition (Ikibaje, 2010). Sturges (2010) observes that corruption is global. Nonetheless, corruption has been conceptualized as the misuse of entrusted power or public office to achieve private ends (Transparency International, 2006). Acts of misconducts such as bribery, extortion, as well as fraud and embezzlement are all construed as aspects of corruption. While several instances of corruption have been witnessed in the developing countries, corruption seems to be an inherent feature of all societies including those of the developed world. Iyada (2012) observes that corruption is a universal problem, which is not a restricted preserve to any nation race or section but rather transcends states’ borders and symbolizes a universal phenomenon.

According to Sturge (2010), the causes of corruption are not cast on a stone tablet as they are numerous and intricately interconnected. Akqay (2006) contends that the causes of corruption are rooted in a country’s socio-cultural history, as well as political and economic development. The bureaucratic traditions and policies are also considered credible sources of corruption (Wanjohi, 2010). While the causes of corruption are general, there are also country-specific causes, which are unique to countries (Khan, Khan, Ahmed & Mehmood, 2012).

According to Uneke (2010), corruption in sub-Saharan Africa is attributable to profound institutional weaknesses. In Africa, and much of the developing world, the causes of corruption are land awards, bloated public sector, the private sector cooperatives, drug
money and the informal sector of the national economy. According to Mbaku (2007), the institutional erosion and the lack of adherence to the rule of law are causal factors for corruption in Africa. Akqay (2006) explains that there exist direct and indirect causes of corruption. He contends that the direct factors, which cause corruption, include such elements as regulations and policies, spending decisions, taxation as well as the provision of goods and public services below prevailing market prices as well as the financing of political parties.

The indirect causes of corruption according to Akqay (2006) are such factors as the penalty systems, transparency or rules and accountability, institutional controls and process that promote corruption. Mbaku (2007) explains that other factors which have been identified as causing corruption in Africa include poverty, low salaries and wages as well as high risks of all kinds such as illness, unemployment, accidents and the lack of insurance. The existence of opportunities of people to engage in corruption is in itself a cause of corruption and weak legislative and judicial systems (Uneke, 2010).

2.2.2 The Common Forms of Corruption

According Svensson (2005) the most devastating forms of corruption include the misappropriation and theft of funds meant for public programs. According to Uneke (2010), grand corruption is one of the most perceptible forms of corruption in contemporary times. He explains that grand corruption transpires when the political elite including the executive or the Presidents abuse their power to make economic policies commit. The political elite are supposed to be the ‘benevolent social guardians’ and are therefore to focus on the common good and make decisions which are solely based on the interest of the populace and not their own (Jain, 2011, p.73).

Despite the fact that the politicians have to balance the public good with their own desire to remain in power and the common interest of the populace, the latter should always take precedence (Fayemi, 2009). However, as several instances around the world indicate, this is never the case. For instance, it is estimated that the former President of Zaire, Mobutu Sese Seko had looted from the public coffers, huge amount of money estimated in the upwards of $5billion which was estimated to be proportionally equal to the amount that the country held in external debt at the time of his ouster in 1997 (Svensson, 2005). At the same time, the former presidents of Indonesia, Mohamed Suharto and Ferdinand Marcos
are alleged to have stolen twice and seven times from Indonesia, what Mobutu stole from
Zaire.

Other instances of corruption in public offices in Africa have been witnessed in addition
to that of Mobutu. For instance, in Angola, the state coffers had lost $1 billion oil
revenues, which were estimated at $77 per capita in 2001 to corrupt public officials. The
amount of cash lost was three times more than what the country had received in terms of
foreign aid. Even more worrying is that the Angolan citizenry is estimated to survive on
less than $1 a day – below poverty lines (Svensson, 2005). Therefore in instances of
grand corruption, the corrupt political leaders influence the national policies of the policy
implementation process to serve their own interests and not that of the populace (Jain,
2011).

Jain (2011) observes bureaucratic corruption as another form of corruption that is
manifested in most societies around the world. According to Hanna, *et al.*, (2011), these
forms of corruption are the fraudulent acts and unethical conducts of appointed
bureaucrats which are manifested in their interactions with the political elite or their
superiors as well as with the general public. In its basis form, commonly referred to as
petty corruption, the bureaucrats demand that the public part with money or other
valuables in order to receive public service which they have a privileged right to acquire
or so that the bureaucrats can speed up a public procedure. According to Agbaje (2004),
the bureaucrats, after receiving the bribes, can even provide a service that is unavailable
under normal circumstances.

Brandolino and Luna (2006), identify another form of corruption which is legislative
corruption. Legislative corruption implies the extent to which the voting pattern of the
parliamentarians is vulnerable to be influenced by internal and external forces operating
within the country and from outside the country (Jain, 2011). The legislators or the
parliamentarians can be bribed by political parties, the government, the local and
international interest groups as well as foreign governments to vote in a particular pattern
even when this is not the wish of the electorate. Legislative corruption may include such
acts as vote-buying buy officials who want to be (re)elected in state positions or by the
government officials who favour certain legislations. Hanson (2009) contends that even
though not quite perceptible due to the level of secrecy in which it is conducted,
legislative corruption is an endemic problem in both the developed and the developing world even though the allure for it tends to be much more in the developing countries.

Wanjohi (2010) contends that public officials in Kenya during the 1990s had embezzled over $1 billion from the government. The money was lost in a fictitious export compensation scheme for fabricated export commodities that the country did not produce. Obasanjo (2004), as reported by Iyada (2012), indicated that the various instances of forms of corruption which comprise of money laundering, fraudulent trade practices, fee fraud, misappropriation of funds, bribery, false declarations, illegal collection of tolls as well as misappropriation of funds. Wanjohi (2010) adds to Obasanjo’s list, virtue or moral principles, integrity impairment, and an unauthorized trade agreement. According to Agbaje (2004), corruption in public service also includes instances of the misuse of power for selfish ends, the pervasion of public rules, and the frustration of free and fair elections.

Transparency International (2006) observes that the bureaucracy in Kenya created a loophole for corrupt officials which made it also almost mandatory for the business operators to part with some money in form of bribes in order to facilitate their operations. According to Martini (2012), the Eastern Africa Bribery Index of 2012 as well as the Global Corruption Barometer of 2011 both indicated that Kenyan citizens have to pay bribes to access public services and obtain simple bureaucratic tasks.

In Kenya, several instances of grand corruption have been noted. According to Wanjohi (2010), several key instances of corruption have been realized in Kenya implicating high state officials sometimes even the executive. Some of these poignant instances of corruption in public offices in Kenya include; the Maize Scam of 2009, the Triton Oil Scandal and the November 2009 Free Primary Education (FPE) funds misappropriation (Martini, 2012). The Nairobi City Council Land scam, the Tokyo Embassy Scandal and the Ministry of Defense public Procurement deal of military hardware form Jordan are some of the mega corruption cases that have caused the Kenyan citizen billions of misappropriated funds (Jarso, 2010).

The Goldenberg saga is considered as being the grandest of instances of corruption in Kenya and which had implicated the top-most political elite in Moi’s regime and which is estimated to have cost the country over 10% of its Gross Domestic Product (Gichio,
In 2005, the Kibaki regime, which had preceded the corrupt Moi regime even though having been viewed as vital in the fight against corruption in Kenya was itself, implicated in a mega-corruption scandal – the Anglo-Leasing Scandal. As noted, several grand corruption scandals have been experienced ever since independence (Jarso, 2010). Political corruption is another form of corruption, which has occurred simultaneously with petty and bureaucratic corruption as well as grand corruption. According to Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission (2006), from the times of independence onwards, Kenyan political parties have been grossly ineffective and weak institutionally. Furthermore, the political parties have been ethnically aligned and based on patronage networks as opposed to being anchored on sound political and policy doctrine (Barkan, 2004). At the backdrop of this, as Martini (2012), contends, corruption has been the outcome. Political ethnocentrism, resource inadequacy and institutional weakness have precipitated susceptibility to corruption. Martini (2012) contends that the 2011 Global Corruption Barometer indicated that Kenyan political parties scored 3.8 on a scale of between 1 and 5 (extremely corrupt).

Jarso (2010) observes that both the Goldenberg and the Anglo-Leasing scandals were closely associated with the absence of transparency in the sources of political party finances. It has been alleged that during the 1990s, the Kenya African National Union (KANU) had raised its campaign fund through the Goldenberg fraud. While key politicians and close allies to Kibaki are indicted for having raised their campaign funds for the 2007 election through the Anglo-Leasing finance scam. The Electoral Commission of Kenya (ECK) is said to have been manipulated in the 2007 elections to falsify tallying process (Martini, 2012).

2.2.3 Anti-Corruption Game Plan

The need for combating corruption arises from the fact that corruption has profound negative effects on economic development and social harmony and cohesion in the state. Myint (2000) contends that the realization that corruption can have devastating effects on socio-economic growth has precipitated the quest for a solution to the vice. The impact of corruption on the society is considered profound especially in the developing world including Africa. In fact, the underdevelopment of African countries vis-à-vis their western counterparts is largely attributed to the wide scale and seeming unabated levels of
corruption in the continent. According to Wanjohi (2010), corruption has been determined as being a key barrier to socio-economic and political development in the developing countries.

Akqay (2006) observes that corruption reduces a society’s and a country’s economic growth, political and social outcomes. Furthermore, corruption retards development and reduces economic growth as it discourages the inflow of foreign investment, depreciates the domestic currency and reduces expenditure in public spending on public services such as health and education (Hanson, 2009). Military spending increases as the need to pacify protests increase. Resource allocation becomes distorted as the levels of inequality and poverty increases and the fundamental role of the government as the enforcer of contracts and protecting properties also becomes distorted (Bardhan, 2000).

Several African countries have formulated and implemented several programs and policies to fight graft (Ikubaje, 2010). These policies have ranged from financial strategies to political or public policies but have remained largely ineffectual in addressing the scourge of corruption in the continent. In fact, over the past decade, African countries at the pressure of the Western donors have implemented policies aimed at boosting transparency and good governance as well as sector reforms with the aim of fighting corruption (Hanson, 2009). Rwanda, Liberia and Tanzania, Mauritius and Ghana have been lauded as having made commendable gains in the war against graft.

The anti-corruption policies and strategies are those activities, which governments have put in place to combat or tackle the corrupt practices (Hanson, 2009). Owing to the escalation in the instances of corruption in Africa and the gravity of the impact of corruption on the socio-economic development, African governments including Kenya have drafted, formulated and implemented various anti-corruption policies and strategies which have been aimed at addressing the problem of corruption in their respective countries. These policies and strategies range from the legal policies, to financial as well as to public strategies (Mauro, 2011).

The EACC however was not accorded the prosecutorial powers by the Kenyan government therefore it has to transfer the cases to the Attorney General after it completes investigations. The commission was initially headed by Patrice Lumuba who had replaced
Justice Aaron Ringera, a close ally of President Kibaki. Lumumba had reopened the Goldenberg and Anglo-Leasing cases and indicated his intentions to initiate investigations on at least four ministers and more than 50 members of parliament and government officials. In August of the same year, Lumumba was suddenly replaced after he cited lack of political will on the part of the country’s leadership on combating and preventing corruption. Mumo Matemu was then appointed to head the body.

According to Martini (2012), another institutional office, which has been deemed crucial in the fight against corruption, is that of the Auditor General. The office of the auditor general had initially been known as the Controller and Auditor General. The institutions being legally protected from political and executive influence, at least in theory has been deemed as being particularly crucial in combating corruption in Kenya (Gichio, 2014). However, the audit reports produced by these offices are widely considered as not being comprehensive enough and as such are grossly considered as not presenting appraisals of extra-budgetary funds. The office of the Ombudsman is another institutional framework for combating corruption in Kenya.

According to Gichio (2014), the office was setup in 2007 as part of the Public Complaints Standing Committee with the mandate of receiving all complaints from the public against public officials or civil servants. The institution was mainly set up to investigate instances of abuse of office, breach of integrity, fraud and unethical conduct. Nonetheless, according to Transparency International (2006) the institution has been considered as vulnerable to political influence and is also contended to be understaffed which has drastically impacted on its effectiveness as a front runner against corruption. In other words the insufficient staff means that the office is innately incapable of dealing with the large number of cases and complaints of corruption reported by the public which it is supposed to investigate (Kibondo, 2006).

The Public Procurement presents another, institutional framework and Oversight Authority (PPOA) established under the Ministry of Finance. The mandate of the PPOA is policy formulation and as well as implementation relating to procurement (Wanjohi, 2010). The PPOA is also supposed to ensure that the procurement process is in line with the legal requirements. All the institutional frameworks are linked to the Attorney
General’s office. The attorney general is given the prosecutorial powers to prosecute cases of corruption.

However, the Attorney General’s office is widely accused of being vulnerable to political influence and as such has been seen as part of the problem rather than being part of the solution as far as the war against corruption is concerned. In fact, as Martini (2012) observes, although the KACC had recommended indictment of several civil servants since the year 2003, the Attorney General’s office had only prosecuted 51 people as of 2012.

2.2.4 Legal and Constitutional Frameworks for Combating Corruption

The recognition of corruption as a development problem with consequences that affect the entire human society has precipitated global efforts to address the problem. According to Brnadolino and Luna (2006), the international community has joined hands to combat corruption through multilateral anti-corruption agreements and treaties. The idea has been to bring together governments in an effort to fight the vice through the formalization of government commitments for the implementation of common principles against corruption.

Among the international legal frameworks for combating corruption is the United Nations Convention on Corruption (UNCAC). According to Brandolino and Luna (2006), UNCAC appreciates that the war against corruption demands a concerted effort on several fronts. Multilateral agreements on corruption address certain anti-corruption fronts including, one; law enforcement in which it recognizes that impartial investigatory, prosecutorial as well as judicial authority is central to the prosecution of public corruption. The second issue that these agreements address is that of public sector prevention.

Brandolino and Luna (2006), explain that public sector prevention encourages governments to take a wide range of initiatives to stop corruption. Hanna, et al. (2011), these initiatives are; the maintenance of high standards of conduct of public officials, the protection of whistleblowers, the demand that public officials declare personal wealth and the establishment of transparent financial management system and public procurement. Others include the creation of effective institutions; and creation procedures for
accountability within the government and the external as well as allowing public access to

The agreements on corruption also include the private sector prevention (Brandolino &
Luna, 2006). The international agreements call upon governments to create mechanisms,
which affect the private sector constructively. These include the maintenance of effective
regulatory framework to prevent bribe payment and the hiding of illicit payments. These
also include the prohibition against deductibility of bribes as well as corporate fraud
(Mauro, 2011). The last thing that international agreements on corruption deal with is the
follow-up mechanism. The agreements call upon party states to set up mechanisms that
may enhance international cooperation and technical assistance to address the
weaknesses. It is important to mention that in modern times, the international agreements
on corruption form the framework upon which national anti-corruption strategies are
anchored (Hanna, et al., 2011).

The most perceptible of the international agreements on corruption is the UNCAC which
entered into force in December 2005. The UNCAC is comprehensive in that it covers all
the areas discussed and establishes an intergovernmental framework for asset recovery.
The UNCAC currently has over 140 signatories. The European countries, through the
Council of Europe (COE), have established three basic instruments which act as
frameworks for fighting corruption. These instruments include the COE Criminal Law
Convention against Corruption (1997), the COE Civil Law Convention against
Corruption and the COE Twenty Guiding Principles to Fighting Corruption. The
European Union (EU) has also provided several documents to guide members in
combating corruption (Brandolino & Luna, 2006). These are; the 1997 EU Convention on
the Fight against Corruption Involving Officials of the European Communities or
Officials of the member states.

In Latin America, the countries established the 1996 Inter-American Convention against
Corruption. In Asia, 21 countries of the Asia-Pacific region established the ABD/OECD
Anti-Corruption Plan for Asia and the Pacific. Even though the agreement is non-binding,
it is crucial in establishing the legal framework for regional war against corruption. The
African governments have also joined to establish regional framework for combating
corruption (Brandolino & Luna, 2006).
It is upon this global and regional trend as well as the internal situation in Kenya, that the successive Kenyan governments have endeavoured to adopt anti-corruption strategies (Barkan, 2004). According to Martini (2012), the legal framework for combating corruption in Kenya is linked to the international efforts for combating and preventing the vice which the country has ratified. The fight against corruption in Kenya was rejuvenation with the acquisition of power in 2002 (Barkan, 2004). In fact, assuming power after much public outcry of corrupt dealings of the Moi regime, corruption was key to Kibaki’s political agenda for Kenya. Since 2002, several laws and legal frameworks were put in place to fight corruption (Jarso, 2010). The promulgation of the Kenya’s new constitution in 2012 has been perceived as a milestone in the fight against corruption (Martini, 2012). The new constitution is aimed at among several other things, to embolden political rights and civil liberties by constraining the executive and strengthening the legislature and the judiciary.

Another legal provision for combating corruption is the Public Officers Ethics act of 2003, which is incorporated in the new constitution, which demands wealth declaration for all the civil servants (Mbaku, 2007). The provision also incorporates the code for the regulation of public servants and advocates for a merit-based recruitment and appointment of public officers. The Anti-Corruption and Economic Crimes and the Witness Protection Act provides for protection of whistleblowers against potential recrimination. The act further provides for the protection of both private and public employees against disciplinary action for their actions of whistle blowing (Kidombo, 2006).

In 2005, the Public Procurement and Disposal Bill was adopted. In tandem with this, the Kenyan government established the procurement commission with the mandate of micromanaging all procurement issues and suggested stringent sanctions on breach of the Act. In 2007, Kenya adopted the Supplies Practitioner’s Management Act, a legal framework for training, conduct and certification of all public procurement officers. Again 2009, the Kenyan parliament adopted the Proceeds of Crime and Money Laundering Act (Martini, 2012). Jarso (2010) contends that this legal document was adopted because of international pressure.
The Kenyan Constitution adopted in a referendum in 2012 is a milestone and in fact, the epitome of the war against corruption. Under Chapter 6, the Kenya Constitution (2010) establishes very high standards for integrity for civil servants and advocates for a sovereign and self-regulating ethics and anti-corruption commission (Kenya Constitution, 2010). The Constitution further champions the strengthening and the protection of civil and political privileges and rights by limiting the executive powers, and expanding the authority of the judiciary. According the Constitution of Kenya (2010), the offices of the auditor general and the controller of the budget are independent public offices.

2.2.5 The Effectiveness of Anti-Corruption Strategies

While the Kenyan government had endeavored to fight corruption especially since the onset of Kibaki’s leadership in 2002, it is surprising that instances of corruption have increased rather than reduced. In fact, the 2007 enactment of the Statute Law (Miscellaneous Amendments) Bill that restricted the newly formed Kenya Anti-Corruption Commission of acts of corruption committed before May 2003 was a major setback. The Miscellaneous Amendments Bill raises questions about the progress that has been made in the country with respect to the fight against corruption having given the perpetrators of the country’s worst corruption a de facto amnesty for their corrupt dealings (Martini, 2012).

The anti-corruption measures are perceived to have been more effective as the data presented by the Global Corruption Barometer indicate that corruption had subsided in the 3 years prior to 2006 (Wanjohi, 2010). Nonetheless, despite these indicators and the many strategies that have been implemented by the Kenyan government, corruption is still rife in Kenya. Martini (2012) contends that corruption has failed to stop due to the government’s failure to prosecute senior public officials who have been implicated in corruption since the Goldenberg and the Anglo-Leasing scandals.

Furthermore, despite the existence of Public Officers Ethics act of 2003, the recruitment of civil servants is still not based on merit but is largely influenced by bribery, nepotism and biasness to the extent that political patronage remains widespread (Wanjohi, 2010). According to Kidombo (2006), the Anti-Corruption and Economic Crimes and the Witness Protection Act are inherently weak. As contends Martini (2012), the Anti-
Corruption and Economic Crimes and the Witness Protection Act lack a complaint mechanism through which public employees can report corruption owing to the absence of operational or effective witness protection laws. In fact, there is no official means of protecting the whistle blowers; this then hinders civil servants from reporting cases of fraud as they feel that they are not well protected from potential repercussions of their whistle blowing (Kidombo, 2006).

2.3 Summary and Gaps to filled
The review of the literature reveals that there exists a gap between understanding corruption and fighting corruption. There is also insufficient information on the link between the anti-corruption strategies that have been adopted and the effectiveness of these strategies. The literature review indicates that corruption is caused by a multiplicity of bureaucratic traditions and policies (Kidombo, 2006). However, in Kenya, there seems to be political and ethno-economic causes of corruption but this has not been sufficiently examined by previous studies.

Furthermore, previous studies have only identified three forms of corruption in Kenya namely, petty and bureaucratic corruption, grand corruption and political corruption, this does not appreciate the corruption that transpires in the private sector. It also does not address the legislative corruption, which is so profound in Kenya (Branch & Cheesem, 2006). In addition, while there exists several institutional and legal anti-corruption strategies and frameworks in Kenya, effective analysis of the extent to which these strategies have influenced the corruption trends in Kenya are lacking. In fact, from the analyses of literature, it is apparent that the success and the effectiveness of these anti-corruption strategies have not been examined by scholars (Hanson, 20009).

Certainly, not much has been done to assess the programs and policies that have been established to combat corrupt practices. The study also assesses the effectiveness of the anti-corruption strategies by evaluating the extent to which they address the causes. This study aims to abridge these gaps in literature by examining the causes of corruption in Kenya, the common forms of corruption in Kenya, the anti-corruption strategies in place in Kenya, the effectiveness of the anti-corruption strategies in Kenya and the legal and constitutional frameworks put in place to fight graft.
2.4 Theoretical Framework

According to Iyanda (2012), the theoretical framework is the structure upon which a research study is anchored and one which supports an existing theory. The theoretical framework presents the theory, which gives insights as to why the research problem under scrutiny exists (Graeff & Stebl, 2010). A theoretical framework can be conceptualized further as a conglomeration of ideas, which guides the research project or business. As such, a theoretical framework is a foundation of the boundaries or parameters of a research study (Shapiro, 2005).

In the study of corruption, several theories offer credible theoretical frameworks for the analysis of the issue, key among these are the modernization theory and the principle-agency theory as well as theories dealing with the issue of economic equilibrium in a society, the modernization theory of corruption and the rational choice theory of corruption (Leruth & Paul, 2007). According to Uneke (2010), there is the modernization theory of corruption, which construes corruption as an integral part of the modernization process.

The modernization theory is a developmentalist approach, which conceptualizes corruption as an inevitable part of the modernization process especially to the extent that it facilitates the transition process to institutionalization (Uneke, 2010). However, the modernization theory is not-self standing and explains itself by implicating the principal-agent theory. It contends that in contemporary bureaucratic systems, corruption is an integral part of the principal-agent relationships (Pardo, 2007).

The principle-agency model construes the political system as an intricate network of principle-agent associations comprising the state officials, citizens, legislative officials, the executive and an intricate web of bureaucracies as well as civil servants (Shapiro, 2005). These groups are involved in a complex process in which they play the agent and principle functions with and across political organizations (Leruth & Paul, 2007). In this complex relationship, the principals delegate to the agents the power to perform their political preferences.

However, occasionally, the goals and desires of the principals and agents may differ due to the asymmetries of information. Principals also occasionally encounter adverse agent opportunism and moral hazard (Shapiro, 2005). The agency problem arises when the
agent takes unfair advantage of the superior information that they are purview to especially when the internal and external condition allow this to happen (Pardo, 2004). According to Uneke (2010), the principal-agent theory contends in each country, the populace grants the government (the principal) the power to perform public duties on their behalf. For instance, the government is to impose and collect taxes, and in turn provide security, healthcare and control crime.

Corruption emerges when the agent in his official activity of executing the functions of the public office, sacrifice the principal’s interests for those of the agent (Graeff & Stebl, 2010). The inherent weakness of the modernization theory and the principal-agent theories of corruption is that they fail to address the causes and the anti-corruption strategies but mainly deal with the explanation of the forms of corruption (Shapiro, 2005). Therefore, the two theories, the modernization and the rational choice theory do not suffice the current study, which deal with the causes, the forms of corruption and the migration strategies addressing the problem of corruption.

Where the modernization and the principle-agent theories fail, another theoretical approach, the rational choice theory offers prevails. According to Pardo (2007), the rational choice theory of corruption offers credible analyses of corruption and anti-corruption strategies. Back (2009), contends that the rational choice theory offers an understanding of the corruption and its causes as well as a conceptualization of the anti-corruption strategies. According to Antony Down (1957) cited in Back (2009), the rational choice theory is grounded on a set of interconnected presumptions. The assumptions of the rational choice theory are that human behavior is inherently directed at the attainment of conscious objectives and that the human individual is a “cost-minimizer and benefit-maximizer” (Back, 2009, p.13).

According to Gephart (2009), the rational choice theory construes corruption as a problem of political economy. This resonates well with Africa and specifically the Kenyan situation in which corruption is seen as a consequence of the weak and ineffective political economy (Wanjohi, 2010). The rational choice theory conceives corruption as emanating from an overarching “stateness” and the absence of accountability mechanisms (Haller, 2005). According to the rational choice theory for corruption, there exists an inherent mutual benefit for the briber and the bribed as both
obtain what they want. However, the gains for the briber are comparative low vis-à-vis that of the bribed as the briber does not have to bribe in the first place as the services are constitutional rights (Agbaje, 2004). Such services as healthcare, education, security among other public services are constitutional rights that have been enshrined in the Kenyan constitutions both current and previous (Gichio, 2014). Giving out bribes to public officials in order to access the services or hasten the provision of these services is only beneficial to the briber and not the bribed.

Gephart (2009) contends that the rational choice assumes that the actor makes the decision to bribe or receives bribe on a cost-benefit basis, which hinges principally on the economic realities that both the briber and the bribed are experiencing at the time of the encounter. In this sense, the rational choice theory conceives corruption as being a crime of calculation never one of choice. According to Brandolino and Luna (2006), the universality of the rational choice theory is perceptible as it applies both to instances of corruption in Kenya as well as global drives for corruption.

Back (2009), contends that rational choice theory provides the framework for combating corruption. He contends that cultural factors influencing the comprehension of how delegated power is to be used and, based on this, how the abuse of authority is conceptualized; linger largely unconsidered in anti-corruption research and practice, both of which are based on the rational choice–institutionalist conception of corruption (Back, 2009). In view of the precepts and underpinning of the rational theory of corruption, it is apparent that this theory offers the best conceptualization of corruption and addresses the pertinent issues which the current study addresses. As such, the study adopts the rational choice theory for the examination of the causes and anti-corruption strategies in Kenya.

2.5 Chapter Summary
This chapter has clearly outlined and provided literature review. It has assessed what scholars and researchers have written concerning corruption, its causal factors, the various forms in which it manifests itself, the anti-corruption strategies including legal frameworks for combating corruption and the effectiveness of the various anti-corruption strategies. It has also provided the theoretical framework for the study. The next chapter will help provide the research methodology that was utilized in the study.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Preamble

This chapter accounts for the research design that was used during the study, the research design, the target population and sample design, data collection method, the research procedure, data analysis method, reliability of the instrument used, Validity of the instrument, Ethical consideration and the summary. Simple random sampling approach was used to give everyone a 50-50 equal chance of participating in the study since it was an opinionated survey.

3.2 The Study or Research Design

Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) further clarified the research design in the plan or the blueprint of the study and comprises of the methods that the researcher applies in deriving the necessary information. The sampling procedure, the sampling method as well as the sampling size and the method of data analysis are integral part of a research design. This study utilized a descriptive research design. Schindler and Cooper (2003), explain that a descriptive research design is crucial in examining social factors that concern human individuals.

3.3 Target Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

A population denotes the entirety of events, persons or objects that do possess a commonality of features and, which the researcher is interested in studying. Furthermore, according to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a population refers to an aggregated unit from which the researcher draws and infers conclusions of the study.

The population for the study included 1024 individuals working with the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (EACC) in Nairobi. The researcher held that this population holds the qualities that the research wants to study with regard to assessing the effects of anti-corruption strategies in Kenya.
3.3.2 Sample Design

3.3.2.1 Sample Frame
A list of individuals, events and happenings from which a suitable sample size is drawn is known as the sampling frame (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). It consists of a list of individuals, objects, events, institution and organizations within a population who can be sampled (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The sample frame for this study comprised of a list of all the registered officials of the EACC, a list which was obtained at the human resource office of EACC.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Method
The method used in drawing population samples for a given study is driven by the objectives of that given research event (Cooper & Schindler, 2011). This particular research used a simple random sampling method to give everyone a 50-50 equal chance of participating in the study because it is an egoistic survey. The method was utilized so as to collect as much possible information from the study subjects or the respondents.

Mugenda and Mugenda, (2003), explained that this method was very suitable when or where the researcher wanted to investigate whether the characteristics or behaviors of certain phenomena cuts across or is pronounced across the units of observation with maximum variation. The researchers approached the senior directors, departmental heads and the general staff members of the EACC based on the computer-generated random numbers and gave them the structured interview schedule to them to fill in their responses. A randomized pre-set toggle application was used to come up with the random numbers ranging between 001 and 1024.

3.3.2.3 The Sample Size
This is termed as the totality of all the observations used for calculating approximations of a given population (Schindler and Cooper, 2000). In my research the sample size is defined as the number of respondents within the EACC here in Nairobi. This study used a formula derived from (Adams&Schvaneveldt, 1985). The formula is shown below;

Sample Size=$n ÷ [1+ (n÷ P)]$

Sample Size=$N ÷ [1+ (N÷ P)]$
The assumption being 95% as the confidence level while 8% being the Margin of error and using the formula by Adams and Schvaneveldt (2007). A sample size of 131 was achieved.

**Table 3.1: Distribution of the sample size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>Target Population (P)</th>
<th>Sample Size (n )</th>
<th>Actual Sample</th>
<th>Percentage (%) Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors and Departmental Heads</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Staff Members</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80.9%T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Numbers</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Method Used in Data Collection

The already prepared interview questionnaires consisted of five key components, namely: the causes of corruption in Kenya; the common forms of corruption; the anti-corruption strategies that have been adopted in Kenya; the legal and constitutional frameworks for combating corruption in Kenya and the impact of anti-corruption strategies in Kenya on the trends of corruption in Kenya. A Likert scale approach of scaling responses was used to collect views and opinions that were to be analyzed using descriptive statistics.

3.5 Research Procedure

Structured questionnaires were developed, and then administered to a small group of the already chosen sample size in a pilot study to test the practicality, validity and reliability of the instrument. The outcome of the pilot study was used to enable the improvement of the data collection instrument. It is important to note that the results of the pilot study was not included as part of the final data results that were presented and analyzed at the end of this study.
The research and actual data collection was done over a period of two months during the summer semester of 2017. During this time the researcher randomly gave out the structured questionnaires following the outcome of the computerized system gotten from the EACC human resources office, to ensure immediate feedback and avoid biasness and ensure high rate response. The respondents were given a two days time framing for them to fill the questionnaires before the collected them immediately after.

3.6 Data Analysis

This research entirely utilized a quantitative data analysis method. The quantitative method of data analysis that was employed included descriptive statistics and correlation analysis. The descriptive statistics was used to present the data, while correlation was used to determine the level of relationships between the variables to ensure easy analysis; coding of the semi structured instruments was done according to each and every variable of the study. The researcher then used tables, graghhs, and frequency distribution tables together with percentages to present his outcome or data. The mathematical calculation was aimed at determining the level of correlation between the independent and the dependent variables. Qualitative data analysis results was analyzed presented using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program in prose or narrative format so as to draw correlations.

3.7 Reliability of Instruments

This is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument produces consistent results or data after repeated trials over and over a period of time. Kothari (2009) refers reliability as the consistency of measurement; the more reliable an instrument is, the more consistent the measure. Reliability is influenced by random error. As random error increases, reliability decreases. Random error is the deviation from a true measurement due to factors that have not effectively been addressed by the researcher (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). The researcher pre-tested the questionnaires to establish whether there are ambiguous questions and correct them to increase the reliability of the data collected. A sample of 10 respondents was arbitrarily selected to participate in the pre-test. These respondents did not participate in the main study to avoid biasness.
3.8 Validity of Instruments

According to Joppe (2009), validity determines whether the research truly measures that which was intended to be measured or how truthful the research results are. Researchers generally determine validity by asking a series of questions, and will often look for the answers in the research of others. Weiner and Braun (1998) describe the validity in quantitative research as the initial concept, notion, question or hypothesis that determines which data is to be gathered and how it is to be gathered. The validity of research instruments was established by the use of expert opinions and literature searches to examine what other related studies have used before.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

A number of ethical considerations were taken into account in this study. A research approval was sought from the university and from National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI) so as to obtain a permit for the research. The researcher personally administered the questionnaires to the respondents. Informed consent to participate in the study was obtained from the respondents by explaining the purpose of the study being assured that the information given was to be treated as confidential. The respondents were requested not to indicate their names anywhere in the questionnaire for anonymity. Their confidential information was only accessed by the researcher and the supervisor.

3.10 Summary of the Chapter

As earlier said this chapter has discussed the research design that was used during the study. The research design utilized a was descriptive research design. I also examined the study target population, data collection method, data analysis method, reliability and validity of the testing instruments, Ethical consideration and the chapter summary. The next chapter will present the findings from the survey using descriptive statistics including tables and bar graphs.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS, ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND FINDINGS

4.1 Preamble

This chapter presents the results that were derived from the field study. The results are interpreted and presented using a number of descriptive statistics including bar graphs, tables and frequency distribution tables. The response rate for the study was 74% as indicated below.

The Response Rate = Number of fully Completed Surveys / Total Number of People Contacted

= 97/131*100

= 0.7404*100

= 74%

4.2 The Causes of Corruption

4.2.1 Socio-Cultural and Bureaucratic Traditions as Causes of Corruption

The respondents were asked to indicate to what extent they believed that the socio-cultural and bureaucratic traditions were causes of corruption in Kenya. Twenty-two-point-seven percent of the respondents (n = 22) and 31% of the respondents (n = 30) indicated that they believed that the socio-cultural and bureaucratic traditions were causes of corruption in Kenya ‘to a little extent’ and ‘to a great extent’ respectively. Eighteen-point-five percent of the respondents (n = 18) were of the opinion that they were ‘not sure’. Twenty-seven-point-eight percent of the respondents (n = 27) indicated that they ‘extensively’ agreed that the socio-cultural and bureaucratic traditions were causes of corruption in Kenya. Table 4.1 depicts these findings.
Table 4.1: Socio-Cultural and Bureaucratic Traditions as Causes of Corruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency (F)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a Little Extent</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a Greater Extent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensively</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Institutional Weaknesses as a Major Cause of Corruption in Kenya

Figure 4.1 shows the results that were obtained when the respondents were asked to indicated whether they agreed that institutional weakness was a major cause of corruption in Kenya. Four respondents (4.1%) indicated that they were ‘not sure’. Ten respondents (10.3%) and seven respondents (7.3%) indicated they disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that institutional weakness was a major cause of corruption in Kenya. On the contrary 39 respondents (40.2%) and 37 respondents (38.1%) indicated that they agreed and strongly agreed respectively that institutional weaknesses was a major cause of corruption in Kenya.

![Figure 4.1: Institutional Weaknesses as a Major Cause of Corruption in Kenya](image-url)
4.2.3 Most Important Cause of Corruption in Kenya

The respondents were asked to pick from a list of four causes of corruption in Kenya, the one that they thought was most important. Eight –point-three percent of the respondents (n = 8) thought that land awards was the most important cause of corruption in Kenya. Twenty-one-point-six percent of the respondents (n = 21) indicated that they thought that the bloated public sector was the most important cause of corruption in Kenya. Twenty-point-seven percent of the respondents (n = 20) indicated that they thought the private sector cooperatives were the most important causes of corruption in Kenya. Nineteen-point-six percent of the respondents (n = 19) indicated that they thought that the lack of transparency and accountability were the important causes of corruption in Kenya.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Frequency (F)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Awards</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloated Public Sector</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Cooperatives</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Transparency and Accountability</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Patronage</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4 Poor Pay Packages and Working Conditions for Civil Servants

Figure 4.2 shows the results that were obtained when the respondents were asked to indicate whether they thought that poor pay packages and working conditions for the civil servants was a cause for corruption in Kenya.
Twenty-eight-point-nine percent of the respondents (n = 28) and 24.8% of the respondents (n = 24) indicated that they strongly agreed and agreed respectively. Twenty-three-point-seven percent of the respondents (n = 23) and 14.4% of the respondents (n = 14) indicated that they strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively that poor pay packages and working conditions for the civil servants was not causing corruption. The remainder of the respondents 8.3% (n = 8) showed that they were not sure.

4.3 The Common Forms of Corruption

4.3.1 Misappropriation and Theft of Public Fund

Table 4.3 is indicative of the results that were obtained when the respondents were asked to indicate to what extent they thought misappropriation and theft of public fund was a common form of corruption in Kenya. Twenty-two respondents (22.7%) and 33 respondents (34%) indicated that they thought, to ‘a little extent and ‘to a great extent respectively’ that misappropriation and theft of public fund was a common form of corruption in Kenya. Eleven respondents (11.3%) indicated that they were ‘not sure’ that misappropriation and theft of public fund was a common form of corruption in Kenya. The rest of the respondents, 31 respondents (32%) indicated that they ‘extensively’ thought misappropriation and theft of public fund was a common form of corruption in Kenya.
Table 4.3: Misappropriation and Theft of Public Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency (F)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a Little Extent</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a Great Extent</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensively</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Grand Corruption

The respondents were asked to indicate whether they agreed that grand corruption was a common form of corruption in Kenya. Figure 4.3 shows the results that were obtained. Three-point-three percent of the respondents (n = 3) indicated that they were not sure. Twenty-four-point-seven of the respondents (n = 24) and 17.5% of the respondents (n = 17) indicated that they disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that grand corruption was a common form of corruption in Kenya. Thirty-eight-point-one percent of the respondents (n = 37) and 16.5% of the respondents (n = 16) indicated that they agreed and strongly agreed respectively that grand corruption was a common form of corruption in Kenya.

Figure 4.3: Grand Corruption
4.3.3 Bureaucratic Corruption
Table 4.4 shows the results when the respondents were asked the extent to which they thought that bureaucratic corruption was evident in Kenya. Twenty-six respondents (26.8%) and 34 respondents (35.1%) that they thought that bureaucratic corruption was evident in Kenya to ‘a little extent’ and ‘to a great extent’ respectively. Eight respondents (8.2%) indicated that they were not sure while 29 respondents (29.9%) indicated that they thought that bureaucratic corruption was evident in Kenya ‘extensively’.

Table 4.4: Bureaucratic Corruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency (F)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To a LittleExtent</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a GreatExtent</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensively</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.4 Petty Corruption
The respondents were asked to indicate whether they agreed that petty corruption was widespread in Kenya. 5.2% of the respondents (n = 5) pointed out that they were not sure if petty corruption was widespread in Kenya. Thirteen-point-four percent of the respondents (n = 13) and 14.4% of the respondents (n = 14) indicated that they disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that petty corruption was widespread in Kenya. On the contrary, 32% of the respondents (n = 31) and 35% of the respondents (n = 34) indicated that they agreed and strongly agreed respectively that petty corruption was a form of corruption present in Kenya. Figure 4.4 shows these findings.
4.3.5 Demands by Public Officers for Bribes/Handouts

The respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which the public were asked to pay bribes or issue handouts in public offices in order to access public services. Table 4.5 shows the findings that were obtained. Nineteen respondents (19.6%) indicated that there were ‘very many’ cases of the public being asked to pay bribes or issue handouts in public offices in order to access public services. Thirty-one respondents (32%) indicated that there were ‘many’ cases of the public being asked to pay bribes or issue handouts in public offices in order to access public services. Twenty-one respondents (21.6%) indicated that there were ‘few’ cases of the public being asked to pay bribes or issue handouts in public offices in order to access public services. The rest of the respondents comprising of 26 individuals (26.8%) indicated that there were ‘very few’ cases of the public being asked to pay bribes or issue handouts in public offices in order to access public services.

**Table 4.5: The Demands by Public Officers for Bribes/Handouts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Many</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Few</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4: Petty Corruption
4.3.6 Political Corruption

Figure 4.5 shows the results that were obtained when the respondents were asked to indicate whether they agreed that political corruption was another form of corruption evident in Kenya. Sixteen-point-six percent of the respondents (n = 16) indicated that they were not sure if political corruption was evident in Kenya. Seventeen-point-five percent of the respondents (n = 17) and 14.5% of the respondents (n = 14) indicated that they disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively that political corruption was a form of corruption evident in Kenya. Twenty-one-point-six percent of the respondents (n = 21) and 29.9% of the respondents (n = 29) indicated that they agreed and strongly agreed respectively that political corruption was present in Kenya.

![Figure 4.5: Political Corruption](image)

4.4 Anti-Corruption Strategies

4.4.1 Kenyan Government Formulated and Implemented Anti-Graft Policies

Figure 4.6 shows the results that were determined when the respondents were asked to indicated whether they agreed that the Kenyan government had formulated and implemented anti-graft policies and frameworks. Twelve-point five percent of the respondents (n = 12.5%) indicated that they were not sure. Thirteen respondents (13.4%) and 21 respondents (21.6%) indicated that they disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively, that the Kenyan government had formulated and implemented anti-graft policies and frameworks. Thirty respondents (30.9%) and 21 respondents (21.6%)
indicated that they agreed and strongly agreed respectively that the Kenyan government had formulated and implemented anti-graft policies and frameworks.

**Figure 4.6: Kenyan Government Formulated Anti Graft Policies**

### 4.4.2 Strategies Implemented to Fight Corruption in Kenya

Table 4.6 shows the results that were obtained when the respondents were asked to identify the strategy that they believed that the government of Kenya had fully implemented to fight corruption. Twenty-point-six percent of the respondents (n = 20) indicated that they believed that the implementation of anti-corruption legal framework was the strategy that the government of Kenya had fully initiated to fight corruption. Thirty-two-percent of the respondents (n = 31) indicated that the establishment of anti-corruption institutional framework was the strategy that the government of Kenya had fully initiated to fight corruption. Another group of individuals comprising of 20.6% (n = 20) indicated that the establishment of the anti-corruption financial framework was the strategy that the government of Kenya had fully initiated to fight corruption. Twenty-six-point-eight percent of the respondents (n = 26) indicated that the establishment of anti-corruption public policies was the strategy that the government of Kenya had fully initiated to fight corruption.
Table 4.6: Some of the Strategies Implemented to Fight Corruption in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Frequency (F)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Anti-Corruption Legal Framework</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Anti-Corruption Institutional Framework</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Anti-Corruption Financial Frameworks</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Anti-Corruption Public Policies</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3 Establishment of Strong Anti-Corruption Institutions

Figure 4.7 shows the results that were obtained when the respondents were asked whether they agreed that the government of Kenya had established strong anti-corruption institutions. Thirty-six respondents (37.1%) and 35 respondents (36.1) indicated that they strongly agreed and agreed respectively that the government of Kenya had established strong anti-corruption institutions. Fifteen respondents (15.5%) and 7 respondents (7.2%) indicated that they strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively that the government of Kenya had established strong anti-corruption institutions. The rest of the respondents comprising of four individuals indicated that they were not sure.

![Figure 4.7: Establishment of Strong Anti-Corruption Institutions](image)

4.4.4 Has Enough Been Done to Combat Corruption in Kenya

The respondents were asked whether they agreed that enough had been done to fight corruption in Kenya. 7.2% of the respondents (n = 7) indicated that they were not sure.
Twenty-seven-point-eight percent of the respondents (n = 27) and 33% of the respondents (n = 32) indicated that they disagreed and strongly disagreed that enough had been done to fight corruption in Kenya. Nineteen-point-six percent of the respondents (n = 19) and 12.4% of the respondents (n = 12) indicated that they agreed and strongly agreed respectively that enough had been done to fight corruption in Kenya. Table 4.7 represents the results that were obtained.

### Table 4.7: Has Enough Been Done to Combat Corruption in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency (F)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.5 The Effectiveness of Anti-Corruption Strategies**

**4.5.1 Effectiveness Anti-Corruption Legal Framework**

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed that the anti-corruption legal framework was effective. Figure 4.8 shows the results that were obtained. Nineteen respondents (19.5%) and 31 respondents (32%) indicated that they believed the anti-corruption legal framework had been effective ‘to a little extent’ and ‘to a great extent’ respectively. Fifteen-point-five percent of the respondents (n = 15) indicated that they were not sure. Thirty-three respondents (n = 32) indicated that the anti-corruption legal framework had been ‘extensively’ effective.
4.5.2 Have Corruption Level Increased or Decreased Over the Past 10 Years

Table 4.8 shows the results that were obtained when the respondents were asked to indicate whether they thought corruption had increased or reduced over the past decade. Ten respondents (10.3%) pointed out that they were not sure. Twelve respondents (12.4%) indicated that they believed that corruption was ‘decreasing’. Twenty-six respondents (26.8%) indicated that they believed that corruption was ‘increasing’. Twenty-seven respondents (27.8) indicated that they believed that corruption was decreasing in some areas. Twenty-two respondents (22.7%) indicated that they believed that corruption was increasing in some areas.

Table 4.8: Have Corruption Level Increased or Decreased Over the Past 10 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency (F)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing in Some Sectors</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing in Some Sectors</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.3 Institutional Frameworks Effective
The researcher asked the respondents whether they agreed that the institutional framework was effective. Figure 4.9 shows the findings. 7.2% of the respondents (n = 7) indicated that they were not sure. Six-point-two percent of the respondents (n = 6) and 16.5% of the respondents (n = 16) indicated that they agreed and strongly agreed that the institutional framework for fighting corruption was effective. Thirty-three percent of the respondents (n = 32) and 37.1% of the respondents indicated that they disagree and strongly disagree that the institutional framework for fighting corruption was effective.

![Figure 4.9: Institutional Frameworks Effectiveness](image)

4.6 Summary
This chapter has presented and tabulated in graphs the results of the study. The chapter has used descriptive statistics to present the data that was obtained in the study. The descriptive statistics used are mainly bar graphs and frequency distribution tables to present the results of the study. The next chapter will be a recap of the entire study and as such it provides the summary of the study and presents discussions of the finding of the study, which is then followed by the conclusion and the study recommendations.
5.1 The Study Summary

The purpose of the study was to assess the effectiveness of anti-corruption strategies in Kenya. This research was guided by five research questions; what are the causes of corruption in Kenya? What are some of the common forms of corruption? What are the anti-corruption strategies that have been adopted in Kenya? What are the legal and constitutional frameworks for combating corruption in Kenya? And how have the anti-corruption strategies in Kenya influenced the trends of corruption in Kenya? The study objectives included; to critically inspect the causes of corruption in Kenya; to identify the various forms of corruption in Kenya; to examine the anti-corruption strategies in Kenya; to assess how the anti-corruption strategies in Kenya have influenced the trends of corruption in Kenya; and last but not least, to determine the legal and constitutional frameworks for combating corruption in Kenya.

The methodology that was utilized was of a descriptive research design. The population for the study included 1024 individuals working with the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (EACC) within Nairobi. The sampling frame for this study comprised of a list of all the registered officials of the EACC, the list was obtained at the human resources office of EACC picked by simple random method by use of a computer generated software for randomization of numbers between 001 1024. The researcher approached the senior directors, departmental heads and the general staff members of the EACC based on the computer-generated software that produced random numbers and gave them the structured interview questionnaires to them to fill in their responses. Computer application software was used to generate the random numbers ranging between 001 and 1024. The study used semi-structured interview questionnaires to collect the necessary data from the potential respondents. The data was analyzed and tabulated using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences program commonly referred to SPSS.

5.2 The Causes of Corruption

The study found that there are several causal factors to corruption in Kenya. The study found that such factors as institutional weaknesses, poor pay packages for the civil
servants, lack of transparency and accountability in public institutions are some of the major causes of corruption in Kenya.

5.3 The Common Forms of Corruption
The study also determined that there were various forms of corruption that exist in Kenya. The various forms of corruption that are found in Kenya according to the research findings are petty corruption, grand corruption, bureaucratic corruption, political corruption as well as private sector corruption.

5.4 Anti-Corruption Strategies
The study found that there are various anti-corruption strategies that have been implemented by the Kenyan government. The study found that these strategies range from legal, to institutional through to financial strategies. The study found further that the government has put in place institutional frameworks to reduce the level of bureaucratic corruption in Kenya.

5.5 The Effectiveness of Anti-Corruption Strategies
The study found that there was mixed results with regard to the effectiveness of the anti-corruption strategies employed in Kenya. The study determined that the instances of grand, political and petty corruption were rising while that of bureaucratic corruption was decreasing in some areas.

5.6 Legal and constitutional frameworks for combating corruption in Kenya
The study found that corruption in public institutions had decreased over the past decade. The study determined however that weak institution had greatly allowed corruption to remain in Kenya.

5.7 Discussion of the Findings
The study has shown that while the causes of corruption are general, there are also country-specific causes, which are unique to countries. For instance, in Kenya corruption manifests itself in various forms which include petty and grand corruption, embezzlement of public funds and a system of political patronage which is well entrenched within the fabric of the Kenyan society (Jarso, 2010). Petty corruption implies a situation in which people have to pay money to obtain public services. Kenyans pay bribes to at least one of
the nine institutions that they access annually and business in Kenya is almost impossible 
to operate without facilitation of payments (Gichio, 2014).

Grand corruption is the high-level scandals that occasionally hit the headlines in Kenya 
(Jarso, 2010). The Goldenberg Scandal was the first major corruption scandal to hit 
Kenya. According to Gichio (2014), the Goldenberg Scandal in which key government 
officials in the Moi-regime were implicated allegedly cost the country over 10% of its 
Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Therefore, in Kenya direct factors, which cause 
corruption, include such elements as regulations and policies, spending decisions, 
taxation as well as the provision of goods and public services below prevailing market 
prices as well as the financing of political parties.

Kenya has struggled to establish frameworks and policies to fight corruption. In fact, the 
legal framework to fight corruption as well as the policies to combat the vice since 1956 
when the Prevention of Corruption Act was established (Hanson, 2009). And since 2002 
concerted frameworks for combating corruption have existed as anti-corruption 
commission have been established and accorded investigative powers.

5.8 Conclusion

5.8.1 Causes of Corruption

At the backdrop of the information and research findings established in this study, it is 
prudent enough to make the following observations and conclusions; that the study 
concludes by contending several factors are to blame for the existence of corruption in 
Kenya. These factors are largely associated with the political culture in Kenya and the 
lack of political will and resolve and to combat corruption in Kenya.

5.8.2 The Common Forms of Corruption

Certainly, corruption is indicted for a multiplicity of socio-economic and even political 
problems and the issue of corruption has been a social and public administration quandary 
since the dawn of social organization. Corruption is manifested in several ways including 
the abuse of public office for private gain, bribery, extortion, fraud and embezzlement 
among other gross misconduct of persons that have been entrusted with public offices.
5.8.3 Anti-Corruption Strategies

The government has formulated, implemented and instituted strategies to fight corruption in Kenya, the war on corruption is still far from over this is mainly due to the fact that the institutions charged with the war on corruption and the individuals that have been picked to head these institutions are still susceptible to corruption themselves. As such, it can be contended that anti-corruption strategies continue to wax strong among the key priorities of the governments and development partners owing to the assumed association between corruption and stagnation in the socio-political and economic underdevelopment of the continental states. In addition, while there exists several institutional and legal anti-corruption strategies and frameworks in Kenya, effective analysis of the extent to which these strategies have influenced the corruption trends in Kenya are lacking.

5.8.4 The Effectiveness of Anti-Corruption Strategies

The effectiveness of the anti-corruption strategies in Kenya is limited. The indications are that corruption is still problematic in Kenya and in fact is increasing in some areas. This is indicative of the fact that so far the strategies that the government has formulated and implemented have not been effective. This could be due to the fact that the institutions and the individuals who are charged with dealing with corruption have themselves been compromised and are indeed corrupt.

5.9 Recommendations

Based on the findings and postulations arrived at in this study, the following recommendations are deemed necessary and important.

5.9.1 Improvement Recommendations

5.9.1.1 Corruption Causes

There is need for the Kenyan government to acknowledge the factors that lead to corruption in Kenya in order to determine and implement effective means of dealing with corruption its various forms. It is important for the government to provide conducive working conditions and reasonable pay packages for the civil servants to ensure that the propensity of corruption in public institutions due to poor pay packages is significantly reduced. The government of Kenya should push for the enactment of more policies that
ensure the empowerment of the public by providing them with good knowledge of their rights and duties as citizens to ensure that they are not pressured into parting with money in order to access public services.

5.9.1.2 Anti-Corruption Strategies

The government of Kenya should implement anti-corruption strategies that address the main causal factors of corruption in Kenya. The government of Kenya should ensure that the anti-corruption strategies that are adopted can be implemented at community level so as to increase the chances of reducing the levels of petty corruption. The government and state officials should ensure that the institutions that are charged with fighting corruption in Kenya are established as independent organs which cannot suffer from any form of political influence and which have prosecutorial powers that can allow them to deal effectively with corruption.

5.9.1.3 Recommendations and Areas for Future Research

Future researchers should conduct more research on the anti-corruption strategies in Kenya and assess the effectiveness of anti-corruption strategies. Future researchers need also to examine the institutional and legal mechanisms that have been established to combat petty corruption as these affects the delivery of public services to the citizens.
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Dear Sir/Madam

RE: LETTER OF INTRODUCTION

I am a Masters student at United States International University currently pursuing a degree of Masters in International Relations. Am in the process of developing a thesis entitled, “AN ASSESSMENT OF GOVERNANCE STRATEGIES IN EAST AFRICA: A CASE STUDY OF ANTI–CORRUPTION MITIGATION IN KENYA” in partial fulfillment of my degree program.

My main objective in writing this letter is thus to request your express authorization and backing in conducting the survey at your institution. I also appeal that you may propose to me some of the staff members that you determine to hold the pertinent information that may aid this study.

I hereby affirm that I will exercise professionalism and abide by the ethical standards research as demanded by research undertaking. I will also abide by the university and the national regulations regarding research. Rest assured that the survey will not have any negative repercussions on your organization.

Yours Sincerely,

Evans Kichwen
The purpose of this study will be to assess the impact of corporate social responsibility on the strategic intent in the banking in industry in Kenya. The researcher is specifically, in soliciting information concerning three areas of interest, namely; the causes of corruption in Kenya; the common forms of corruption; the anti-corruption strategies that have been adopted in Kenya; the legal and constitutional frameworks for combating corruption in Kenya; the impact of anti-corruption strategies in Kenya on the trends of corruption in Kenya.

Consider each question thoughtfully and answer it to the best of your ability; where necessary check [V] the boxes provided. Be reminded that there are no correct or inaccurate responses; your replies are vital to the study.

Kindly Note: all responses to this survey are completely confidential any identifying information will be removed from this survey instrument and destroyed as soon as all data have been collected and processed.

Thank you for your participation in this study

Section A: Background Information

1. How long have you worked in the EACC or any institution that fights corruption?
   [ ] Less than A Year  [ ] 1 – 2 years
   [ ] 3 years  [ ] 4 Years

2. What is your current position in the EACC?
   [ ] General Staff  [ ] Departmental Head
3. Would you agree that your institution (EACC) presents a crucial front in the war against corruption?

[ ] Not Sure
[ ] Strongly Disagree [ ] Agree
[ ] Strongly Agree

[ ] Disagree

4. To what extent would you say that your organization has aided the war against corruption?

[ ] To a little extent
[ ] Not Sure
[ ] Extensively

[ ] To a great Extent

5. To what extent would you say that you are acquainted with information regarding the effectiveness of anti-corruption activities in Kenya?

[ ] To a little extent
[ ] Not Sure
[ ] Extensively

[ ] To a great Extent

Section B: The Causes of Corruption

6. To what extent would you agree that socio-cultural history and the bureaucratic traditions are major causes of corruption in Kenya?

[ ] To a little extent
[ ] Not Sure
[ ] Extensively

[ ] To a great Extent

7. Kindly provide an explanation for your answer above.

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

8. Would you agree that corruption in Kenya is caused by institutional weaknesses?

[ ] Not Sure
[ ] Strongly Disagree [ ] Agree
[ ] Strongly Agree

[ ] Disagree
9. What would you say is the reason for your answer above?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

10. In the table below are some of the major causes of corruption in Kenya. Kindly, tick the one you consider the most important cause of corruption in Kenya.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land awards,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloated public sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector cooperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Transparency and Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Patronage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Do you agree that poorly paid civil servants are likely to engage in corrupt activities?

[ ] Not Sure  [ ] Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree[ ] Agree
[ ] Strongly Agree

**Section C: The Common Forms of Corruption**

12. To what extent would you say that the misappropriation and theft of funds meant for public programs is a common form of corruption in Kenya?

[ ] To a little extent  [ ] To a great Extent
[ ] Not Sure  [ ] Extensively
13. Do you agree that grand corruption is one of the most perceptible forms of corruption in Kenya?

[ ] Not Sure [ ] Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree [ ] Agree
[ ] Strongly Agree

14. To what extent would you say that bureaucratic corruption, the fraudulent acts and unethical conducts of appointed bureaucrats is entrenched in Kenya?

[ ] To a little extent [ ] To a great Extent
[ ] Not Sure [ ] Extensively

15. Do you agree that petty corruption is another instant of corruption evident in Kenya?

[ ] Not Sure [ ] Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree [ ] Agree
[ ] Strongly Agree

16. What is the frequency of the public being asked to part with cash or grant public officials favors in order to obtain public services or goods?

[ ] Very Many [ ] Many
[ ] Few [ ] Very Few

17. Do you agree that political corruption does exist in Kenya?

[ ] Not Sure [ ] Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree [ ] Agree
[ ] Strongly Agree
18. What is the reason for your answer above? Please explain

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Section D: Anti-Corruption Strategies

19. Do you agree that the Kenyan government has formulated and implemented policies to fight corruption in Kenya?

[ ] Not Sure                      [ ] Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree[ ] Agree
[ ] Strongly Agree

20. What is the reason for your answer above? Please explain

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

21. Which of the following strategies would you say that the government has implemented to address the issue of corruption in Kenya?

[ ] Implementation of Anti-Corruption Legal Framework

[ ] Establishment of Anti-Corruption institutional frameworks

[ ] Establishment of anti-corruption Financial Strategies  [ ] Establishment of anti-corruption public policies

22. Would you say that the government of Kenya has established effective institutions with power to fight corruption?

[ ] Not Sure                      [ ] Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree[ ] Agree
[ ] Strongly Agree
23. Kindly elaborate on your answer above.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

24. Do you believe enough has been done to fight corruption in Kenya?
   [ ] Not Sure                        [ ] Disagree
   [ ] Strongly Disagree [ ] Agree
   [ ] Strongly Agree

25. To what extent would you say that Kenyan government has implemented the legal framework to combat corruption in Kenya?
   [ ] To a little extent                       [ ] To a great Extent
   [ ] Not Sure                              [ ] Extensively

Section E: The Effectiveness of Anti-Corruption Strategies

26. Would you agree that the anti-corruption strategies that have been employed in Kenya have been effective?
   [ ] Strongly Agree                        [ ] Agree
   [ ] Not Sure                              [ ] Disagree
   [ ] Strongly Disagree

27. Kindly, provide a reason for your answers above.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

28. Compared to 10 years ago, would you say that corruption levels in Kenya are on the increase or are relenting?
   [ ] Increasing       [ ] Reducing
   [ ] Not Sure                              [ ] Decreasing in Some sectors
   [ ] Increasing in Some sectors
29. Kindly, provide a reason for your answers above.

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

30. Do you believe that the existing legal and institutional frameworks are effective enough in addressing the problem of corruption in Kenya?

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Agree
[ ] Not Sure
[ ] Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

End

Thank You for Your Participation in the Survey.